

REMARKS

The Examiner has required Applicant under 35 U.S.C. § 121 to elect a single disclosed species for prosecution. The Examiner identifies species 1, as shown in Figure 1, species 2, as shown in Figure 4, and species 3, as shown in Figure 13. Further, the Examiner states that Claims 1, 12, 25, 36 and 49 are generic.

Applicant respectfully traverses the election requirement in the interest of efficiency and economy. Searching and examining the non-elected species does not pose an undue burden on the Examiner and saves the Applicant considerable expense. Applicant requests that the Examiner reconsider the election requirement.

Because Applicant is required to make an election and indicate which claims are readable on the elected species, Applicant elects species 1 and states that Claims 1-6, 11-19, 24-30, 35-43, 48-53 and Claim 58 read on the elected species. Claims 7-10, 20-23, 31-34, 44-47 and 54-57 are withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action and the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested. If the Examiner

believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 641-1600.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: December 22, 2005

By:


Michael Malinzak, Reg. No. 43,770

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.
P.O. Box 828
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303
(248) 641-1600

MM:ca